

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application.

Claims 1-4 and 7-23 are pending and are amended to preclude interpretation under 35 U.S.C. §112, sixth paragraph, to assure infringement of the apparatus claims when the apparatus is sold, to define positive and active method steps in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §101, and to ensure proper antecedent basis and consistency among claims. In addition, claims 8 and 14 are amended to depend on claims 7 and 13, respectively.

Applicants traverse the double-patenting rejection. In a concurrently filed Amendment, the claims of copending Application Serial No. 09/875,950 are amended so there is a clear line between the claims of each application.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 1-5, 7-11, and 13-23 as being anticipated by Klostermann (EP 0 854 423). The Examiner apparently has confused the independent claims of the present application with those of copending Application Serial No. 09/875,950. The Office Action states that Klostermann discloses a "data protection component," which is not a feature of the independent claims of the present application.

The independent claims require, either directly or indirectly, that the second data storage area is partitioned such that a specific set of memory locations is **reserved** for data

relating to another individual computer device. Although a storage device attached to each of four platforms 2-5 in Klostermann stores data relating to the other platforms, Klostermann fails to disclose a specific set of memory locations that are reserved for this purpose.

There is no mention in Klostermann that space on storage devices A-D is reserved for data relating to a particular platform. The embodiment of FIG. 3 includes "location registration means" 17, but this merely keeps track of what data has been written where for data access purposes, rather than specifically reserving memory locations for individual platforms. The reference mentions that location registration means 17 can comprise a data partitioning algorithm or rules, but has no indication that the data partitioning algorithm causes space to be reserved for storing data relating to individual platforms. This reflects a major difference between the network method and computer entity of present invention and that of Klostermann.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 6 and 12 as being obvious over Klostermann and Sharman (U.S. Patent No. 5,586,310), which obviously fails to cure the noted deficiencies of claims 1 and 7, upon which claims 6 and 12 respectively depend.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are deemed in order.

To the extent necessary during prosecution, Applicants hereby request any required extension of time not otherwise requested and hereby authorize the Examiner to charge any required fees not otherwise provided for, including extension of time and extra claims fees, to Deposit Account No. 07-1337.

Respectfully submitted,

**LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP**

By:   
Allan M. Lowe, Reg. No. 19,641

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
703-684-1111 telephone  
703-518-5499 telecopier  
AML:rk